1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS		
3	ABILENE DIVISION		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) CASE NO. 1:19-CR-00021-P-BU		
5)) HELD IN FORT WORTH, TEXAS		
6	vs.) FEBRUARY 20, 2020		
7	CHRISTOPHER JAMES REGAN) 3:25 P.M.		
8	VOLUME 1 TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK T. PITTMAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
9			
10	APPEARANCES:		
11	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: KYLE P. REYNOLDS		
12	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CRIMINAL DIVISION, CHILD EXPLOITATION		
13	1400 New York Avenue NW Washington, DC 20530		
14	Telephone: 202.616.2842		
15	ANN HOWEY JEFFREY R. HAAG		
16	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS		
17	1205 Texas Avenue, Rm 700 Lubbock, Texas 79401		
18	Telephone: 806.472.7394		
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT: JACOB AUSTIN BLIZZARD Blizzard & Zimmerman, PLLC		
20	441 Butternut Street Abilene, Texas 79602		
21	Telephone: 325.455.8842		
22	COURT REPORTER: MONICA WILLENBURG GUZMAN, CSR, RPR 501 W. 10th Street, Room 301		
23	Fort Worth, Texas 76102 Telephone: 817.850.6681		
24	E-Mail: mguzman.csr@yahoo.com		
25	Proceedings reported by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer.		

1	INDEX	
2	PAGE	VOL.
3		
4	Appearances3	1
5	Defendant Admonished3	1
6	Objections to the PSR by Mr. Blizzard6	1
7	Court's Ruling7	1
8	Motion - Downward Departure or Variance	
9	By Mr. Blizzard12	1
10	Response by the Government14	1
11	Court's Ruling15	1
12	Sentencing Statements	
13	By Mr. Blizzard17	1
14	By Defendant22	1
15	By the Government25	1
16	Sentence of the Court25	1
17	Objection to Sentence31	1
18	Government's Motion to Dismiss32	1
19	Court's Ruling32	1
20	Defendant Admonished - Appellate Rights32	1
21	Proceedings Adjourned33	1
22	Reporter's Certificate33	1
23		
24		
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (February 20, 2020, 3:25 p.m.) 3 THE COURT: Court calls Criminal Action Number 4 1:19-CR-21-P-2, United States of America vs. Christopher James 5 Regan for sentencing and further proceedings. 6 At this time I'd ask the attorney to please identify 7 themselves. MR. BLIZZARD: Jacob Blizzard present and ready for 8 9 Christopher Regan. 10 MR. REYNOLDS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Kyle 11 Reynolds, Ann Howey and Jeff Haag on behalf of the Government, 12 present and ready. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. 13 14 Mr. Regan, I need you to state your full name for 15 the record acknowledging your presence in the courtroom. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Christopher James Regan. THE COURT: Mr. Regan, you appeared before U.S. 17 Magistrate Judge John L. Parker on October the 11th, 2019. 18 19 that time you entered a plea of guilty to Counts 1, 2 and 3 of 20 the superseding indictment, charging you with conspiracy to 21 produce child pornography and production of child pornography, 22 that's a violation of 18 U.S.C., Section 2251(a) and 2251(e). On that day Judge Parker found your plea of guilty 23 24 was a knowing and voluntary plea supported by an independent 25 basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the

1 offense. You told him at that time you understood the 2 elements of the offense, agreed to the accuracy of the factual 3 resume and admitted that you committed all essential elements 4 of the offense. 5 Accordingly I entered an order accepting your plea 6 and adjudging you guilty of the crimes alleged in the 7 superseding indictment against you. Your plea of guilty was 8 made pursuant to the plea agreement. I've had an opportunity 9 to review the plea agreement and the charges to which the 10 defendant has plead guilty and it's my determination that the 11 charge accurately reflects the seriousness of defendant's 12 actual offense behavior so that by accepting the plea agreement I will not undermine the statutory purposes of 13 14 sentencing, all relevant conduct having been taken into 15 consideration in the calculation of your criminal defense 16 level. 17 Therefore, the plea agreement is accepted and 18 judgment and sentence imposed here today will be consistent 19 with it. 20 Mr. Blizzard, did you and your client receive in a 21 timely manner a copy of the presentence investigation report? 22 MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir. THE COURT: And the addendum? 23 24 MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir. 25 THE COURT: Have you had an opportunity to carefully

1 review it with Mr. Regan? 2 MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Did the Government timely receive those 3 4 documents? MR. REYNOLDS: We did, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Blizzard, you've appeared in front 6 7 of me, you know how I like to do the objections. MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir. 8 THE COURT: At this time I'll give you my tentative 9 rulings with regards to the numerous objections lodged by 10 11 Mr. James Regan. The defendant has objected to paragraphs 95, 12 104 and 113 of the presentence report. My initial tentative 13 ruling on those is they should be overruled, specifically 14 based on my interpretation of the Sentencing Guidelines of 15 2G1.1, Appendix Number 1. 16 You've also lodged an objection to paragraph 115 and 17 the use of enhancement under the guidelines of misrepresentation of Mr. Regan's identity and his use of the 18 19 computer and the act of computer services. Again, my 20 understanding of the guidelines is that that objection should 21 be overruled. 22 Furthermore, an objection has been lodged to 23 paragraph 140 of the presentence report on the grounds that your client has accepted responsibility for his actions, but 24 25 did not receive a reduction. My reading of the filing in this

case and the facts, as well as the case law, I tend to agree that should be overruled.

Finally, you objected to paragraph 191. The Government has agreed to that, and my tentative ruling is that objection should be sustained.

So, at this time, Counsel, you may present any objection or evidence that you'd like for me to consider in regards to the tentative findings that I just stated.

MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

Your Honor, I will stand on my written objections as to all previously asserted, except I would add the comment on the misrepresentation, because I believe the Court has heard some evidence on that as well already this afternoon. Just for the purposes of this hearing, I would ask the Court to take judicial notice of the hearing/sentencing involving Tanya Regan.

THE COURT: I'm happy to do so.

MR. BLIZZARD: Thank you, Your Honor.

And the misrepresentation here, I believe the Government adequately stated in their response to the sentencing persuasive argument for a lesser sentence, the Government's response to that was that Ms. Regan was never under some delusion that Mr. Regan was an actual different person. He never represented himself to be someone to her and have her believe that she was that person.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Regan.

He engaged -- they engaged frequently, as seen in their writings and the evidence in the case and the chats, they would be communicating about various fantasies, about various role plays of who they were to each other and to their children. And so, in that context, I don't believe that the argument supports the -- the enhancement is not supported by the evidence, because Mr. Regan did not use such a misrepresentation to induce the children's acts in this case. I know the Court heard some arguments that that was used by Tanya Regan. She was shown some -- showed victim one some suggestions and documentation, but there's no evidence that suggests that Mr. Regan had knowledge of that. That's all I have as far as my objections, Your Honor. THE COURT: Would the Government like to make any response or would you like to rest on the tentative findings that I've made and any objections that you stated in writing? I'm happy to make my rulings at this time. MR. REYNOLDS: We will rest, Your Honor, on our written objections, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. I'm prepared to make my final rulings on the various objections at this time with the proviso I will take judicial notice of the arguments and evidence that's been presented in the previous hearing of

At this time I'm going to make my final rulings with regards to the objections lodged by Mr. Christopher James Regan. With regard to defendant's objections to paragraphs 95, 104 and 113 of the presentence report in which the defendant contends he did not distribute child pornography, it was his wife, the Sentencing Guidelines define "distribution" to include any act or possession with intent to distribute, production, transmission, advertisement and transportation related to the transfer of material involved in the sexual exploitation of a minor. And that's at Section 2G1.1, Appendix Note 1 on the Guidelines. Sending pornography to one's wife satisfies the plain meaning of distribution; therefore, that objection is overruled.

With regards to the defendant's objection to paragraph 115. The defendant objects to paragraph 115 regarding the enhancement under 2G1(b)6 of the Guidelines for misrepresentation of his identity and his use of a computer and an interactive computer service. Defendant's intention, as I understand it, is that misrepresentation of his identity is only in the context of role playing with his wife, and she understood that the defendant was playing the role and not an online psychologist or doctor. This enhancement applies, "For the purpose of producing sexually explicit material or for the purpose of transmitting such material live, the offense involved (A) a knowing misrepresentation of participant's

identity to persuade, induce, entice, coerce or facilitate the travel of a minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct; or (B) the use of a computer or an interactive computer service to (1) persuade, induce, entice, coerce, facilitate the travel of a minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct, or to otherwise solicit participation by a minor in such conduct; or (2) solicit participation with a minor in sexual explicit conduct."

Misrepresentation of the party's identity must be, "Made directly to the minor or to the person who exercises custody, care or supervisory control of the minor." And that's Section 2G2.1 of the Guidelines.

Additionally, if the enhancement is based on the use of a computer, the computer must have been used to communicate directly with a minor or the person that exercises custody, care or supervisory control of the minor. Here Tanya Regan undisputedly exercised custody, care, supervisory control over victim two, and Christopher Regan misrepresented his identity to her and used a computer and interactive computer service in an attempt to persuade, entice and groom victim two into sexual acts with him.

Christopher Regan pretended to be at least two different doctors, a homemaker, various members of Tanya Regan's family and a number of commercial pornography producers. While pretending to be these individuals, he gave

Tanya specific instructions in an effort to groom and entice victim two into sexual activity. All of these communications were made with a computer and an interactive service.

The defendant claims this is all role play. While being interviewed by Homeland Security Investigations in October of 2018, Tanya Regan stated a "psychiatrist" advised her to sexually abuse victim two, and she was given the psychiatrist's contact information by Christopher Regan.

Furthermore, there are countless online chats and e-mails between Tanya Regan and profiles controlled by Christopher Regan and no evidence that while the communications were taking place Tanya believed she was communicating with Christopher Regan. Even if Tanya Regan was aware that Christopher Regan was the person behind the various accounts, the enhancement provided by Section 2G1(b)6 would still apply because Christopher Regan misrepresented his identity to victim two and used a computer and interactive computer service to communicate with him.

As set forth in the presentence investigation report, Christopher Regan used the e-mail address stephanykendrickmd@gmail.com to pretend to be a doctor and counsel Tanya Regan to sexually abuse victim two. During Tanya Regan's exchanges with that address, Christopher Regan sent messages addressed directly to victim 2. Therefore, defendant's objection to paragraph 115 is hereby overruled.

With regards to defendant's objection to paragraph 140, the defendant objects to paragraph 140 in the presentence investigation report on the grounds that he accepted responsibility for his actions, including his previous efforts to obstruct justice, but did not receive a reduction of said sentence. The Sentencing Guidelines make it clear that in the vast majority of cases obstruction of justice is incompatible with acceptance of responsibility. However — there may be, however, extraordinary circumstances — extraordinary cases in which adjustments under Sections 3C1.1 and 3E1.1 may apply. That is according to the Sentencing Guidelines Section 3E1.1.

Defendant objects that he did not receive a reduction for acceptance of responsibility, but he provides no justification for this being an extraordinary case that calls for reduction despite his own obstruction of justice. Courts have refused to award reductions for acceptance of responsibility based on obstructive conduct that was much less serious than Christopher Regan's. If you want an example of that see *United States vs. Juarez-Duarte*, 513 F.3d 204, 211 of the Fifth Circuit.

Less than 24 hours after law enforcement executed a search warrant at his home and seized his cell phone,

Mr. Regan logged onto an online platform and remotely wiped that phone in order to avoid -- to avoid law enforcement from obtaining incriminating evidence on it. Defendant tried to

get his mother to destroy evidence for him, and he and his wife engaged in a months-long effort to draft dozens of letters falsely pretending that he was innocent and his wife was responsible for all of the criminal conduct.

Defendant obstructed justice or tried to do so repeatedly for months. He began to accept responsibility only shortly before trial. Therefore, defendant's objection to paragraph 140 is overruled.

Finally, defendant objects to paragraph 191, in that it references that defendant sent images to family members.

The Government agrees with defendant's correction to paragraph 191, that objection is sustained. All right. Those are my final rulings with regard to objections.

Defendant also filed a motion for downward departure and downward variance. And I'd like to tell you I've had an opportunity to reread that and review it, and I am inclined to deny it, but I'm happy to hear otherwise. So, go ahead.

MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

Your Honor, this case is egregious, no doubt, as the Court has correctly pointed out. We have attached to our motion for downward departure a report of Dr. Dunham. And Dr. Dunham, although he has some serious reservations about his findings on Mr. Regan, in not doing the Static-99R, which is the assessment used by prison facilities for the release of sex offenders back into population to assess their risks, this

1 risk factor showed that Mr. Regan only had two points and that 2 he was of an average to moderate risk. Now, granted, Dr. Dunham believed that Mr. Regan --3 4 you know, this being the egregious case that it is, that 5 instrument may not adequately reflect that. However, Mr. --6 or Dr. Dunham noted that Mr. Regan has the propensity for 7 successful completion of section offender treatment. 8 is a good candidate for rehabilitation given other dynamic factors in his life; such as, stable employment, lack of 9 criminal history and no drug or alcohol abuse in the past. 10 11 And with those matters in mind, successful sex 12 offender treatment means rehabilitating Mr. Regan to a point 13 to where one day he can re-enter society and society can be 14 protected because of that successful completion of sex 15 offender treatment. 16 I have additional argument, Your Honor, as far as the sentence itself. I don't know whether you want me to go 17 into that now or you would like to rule on this. 18 THE COURT: I'd like to rule on your motion. 19 can save that for the allocution stage if you'd like. 20 21 MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Would the Government like to make any response in the motion for downward departure? I'll note that 23

I've given significant time to both the detailed sentencing

memorandum that was filed in this case as well as your

24

25

response to the motion. So, keep that in mind when you make your decision.

MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.

We would just note that given the nature and the intensity and the duration of the abuse in this case, as well as the fact that the offense level is so far above the guidelines chart, a downward departure or a downward variance would be highly inappropriate in this case.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

All right. I note for the reasons that have been expressed in the various filings, also based on what I've heard today, the motion for downward departure or variance is going to be denied.

Christopher Regan has asked the Court to impose a 25-year sentence, which is 65 years lower than the sentence recommended by the Guidelines and represents a downward variance of 72.2%. Considering good-time credit this recommendation could lead to Christopher Regan serving just over 21 years in prison for this egregious offense.

The sentencing table and the Sentencing Guidelines recommended a life sentence for Mr. Regan. In fact, it would still recommend a life sentence for an offender whose conduct was significantly less egregious than Mr. Regan's. A sentence of just 25 years fails to adequately satisfy the retributive goal of just punishment given the conduct in this case.

Furthermore, Christopher Regan identifies no comparable cases to justify his request for such a massive downward variance from the guideline range.

In fact, the only basis for a downward variance that Mr. Regan identifies in his motion is the psychological evaluation with Dr. Jason Dunham. This estimates -- this evaluation estimates Mr. Regan's "Level of risk for sexual re-offense is within the high range." The Court does not believe that a psychologist's conclusion that Regan poses a high risk for committing more sex crimes against children is a valid ground for reducing his sentence.

The only way for the Court to support a downward variance in this case is through an extraordinary justification. The Court finds no such justification exists in this case to support any downward variance, let alone three quarters of a reduction in his sentence. Christopher Regan's conduct was unspeakable, his victims were numerous, his case involves virtually no mitigating factors and his own psychological evaluation confirms that he poses a high risk for sexual re-offending. Therefore, the Court hereby denies Christopher Regan's motion for downward departure or variance.

With the Court's ruling on the motion for downward departure and variance, as well as those that I've just stated previously with regard to the defendant's objections, I will adopt the final findings of fact and statements of fact made

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the presentence report, subject to and including a change in qualifications made by the addendum to the presentence report that I made in response to the objections to the presentence report. After having considered the conclusions expressed by the probation officer in the presentence report as to the appropriate guideline calculations and having considered the objections and made my rulings thereto, I determine the appropriate guideline calculations in this case are as follows: Total offense level 43, criminal history category I, imprisonment range for Count 1 of 360 months; imprisonment range of 360 months for Count 2; Count 3, imprisonment range of 360 months, for a total sentencing range of 1,080 months total. Supervised release range as to Count 1, five years to life, Count 2, five years to life; Count 3, five years to life, each term to run concurrently with the others. Possible fine range of \$50,000 to \$250,000 plus cost of imprisonment and supervision. At this time I'd ask the United States Probation, did I say everything correctly, as far as you're concerned? PROBATION OFFICER: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Regan, I want to let you know that I received from the Government two letters from the victims in this case.

```
1
     And I want you to know that they will go into consideration
 2
     when I determine the appropriate sentencing. I have reviewed
 3
     those.
 4
               Mr. Blizzard, do you wish to make any remarks on
 5
     behalf of your client?
               MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
               MR. BLIZZARD: Your Honor, I think that our
 8
     principal argument I would make here to the Court is that this
 9
10
     Court should vary from the guideline sentence of 90 years, and
11
     the basis for that is to impose an equitable sentence. As the
12
     Court knows, this Court assessed the sentence of, technically,
13
     50 years on Tanya Regan, and Ms. Regan is the primary culprit
     in this encounter.
14
               THE COURT: So, the thought is that I reduce
15
16
     sentencing because he is blaming it on his wife; is that what
17
     you're telling me?
18
               MR. BLIZZARD: I'm sorry, Judge, I couldn't hear
19
     you.
20
               THE COURT: So, you're trying to tell me that
21
     Mr. Regan deserves a significant variance from his wife of 50
22
     years; is that what you're arguing?
               MR. BLIZZARD: It is somewhat, yes, sir.
23
24
               THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
25
               MR. BLIZZARD: And the idea here, Your Honor, if I
```

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

may, is to change the narrative here of what's been presented. 2 The narrative that's been presented here is that this is all 3 at the behest of Mr. Regan and this is all his doing, but I 4 don't believe that the evidence bears out on that. And I 5 believe that the Government's argument in opposition to reduction for Tanya Regan supports the fact that she is 7 equally culpable. And the analogy that I would draw the Court to even 9 hear is in a bank robbery case. You may have someone who plans the bank robbery and says, Hey, go in there and take this machine gun and I want to you kill everybody in the bank. And then you have somebody who goes into the bank, not the planner, and that person goes in and kills everyone in the 14 bank. And so, the question, I think, for the Court to consider in this matter is who was the more culpable person of those two? Surely they bear significant responsibility, but it is a far more dangerous and serious offender, in my opinion, that would be the person that went in and pulled the trigger. And here, in this case, Mr. Regan --THE COURT: I don't know how you can argue who was 22 more culpable, the planner or the one who pulled the trigger. MR. BLIZZARD: I understand, Your Honor. I 24 certainly see that position. The analogy that I'm trying to draw to in this case is that of the vast number of images and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

videos that depict the abuse in this case only one features Mr. Regan. There is many hours of videos that feature Ms. Regan abusing victims in this case. And it's because, for the most part, Mr. Regan did not participate in the abuse itself, he watched and/or recorded it. Certainly still a crime, and certainly still a very serious problem. But the kind of position I'm putting here to the Court is, again, as to rehabilitation, I believe Mr. Regan is a person that is not beyond that scope, he is not beyond rehabilitation. And, you know, the Court will note as well, as was mentioned in Tanya Regan's sentencing, Mr. Regan suffered abuse as a child as well. And so, what happened here, you put two abuse victims who got together and decided it was normal and that's what they wanted to do. Certainly, it's not good. Certainly, it's very egregious, but the position that I have, Your Honor, is that it would be inequitable in this scenario to sentence Tanya Regan out of a sense of plea bargains because both defendants effectively would have received life sentences had they gone to trial and were convicted, charged with very similar levels of offenses. But Ms. Regan, through, you know, being the first to the table, being the first to talk to the U.S. Attorney's office gets to plead to two offenses and Mr. Regan gets to

plead to three. And granted, there's some other culpability

there in terms of obstruction of justice, but, again, both people participated in the obstruction of justice.

And so, it's our position, Your Honor, that the equitable sentence in this case would be to sentence Mr. Regan to a level similar to that of Ms. Regan, if the Court is not inclined to grant the motion for downward departure.

You know, I would, again, draw the Court back to the statement Ms. Howey made in response to Ms. Regan's argument in sentencing, in that there is no evidence that Ms. Regan was coerced, forced or threatened in any way and that she was never coerced or manipulated in any way, and that's because that's not the case. Mr. Regan is not a mastermind who subjected his wife to this isolated society, as was portrayed in her sentencing. It's two people who had similar interest to do similar things.

And so, the -- I think that there's a saying about that, deep calls to the deep, you know. And the deep desires of the person call out to and it's not hard to find the deep desires of another person of similar interests.

And, you know, another thing Ms. Howey mentioned in her sentencing comments towards Ms. Regan was that, you know, Ms. Regan engaged in beating, tormenting and tying up the victims. And Mr. Regan has also admitted to that, but, again, on a more limited basis than the extent that Ms. Regan has.

THE COURT: There's crimes that have been sentenced

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

out of this district, including the judge upstairs on the fourth floor where he sentenced an individual to 50 years in prison for just having one enticement and one incident, and that was upheld by the Fifth Circuit. MR. BLIZZARD: I understand, Your Honor. understand it's within your discretion. THE COURT: That was determined to be appropriately reasonable. MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir. And I certainly agree that you are within your discretion to impose whatever sentence you believe is reasonable. So, we're not arguing that the sentence would be unreasonable, simply trying to draw the Court's attention to the facts of this specific case. THE COURT: I understand. And I did spend the time in this case, including all the filings. MR. BLIZZARD: Yes, sir, I understand. Judge, the last thing I would leave you with, in terms of argument, is in reflecting on victim one's statement that was given to the Court, the thing that stands out to me is that this is a statement vastly about Tanya. This is a statement that references the terrible things done by both defendants, but mostly about her. And she is named first and she is named with specific examples of the terrible things that she represented to him and said to him and did to him. And so, again, that just goes to our argument that we just

```
1
     don't want the Court to have the impression that Ms. Regan --
 2
     that Mr. Regan is this mastermind person who controlled her,
 3
     manipulated her, forced her to do these things, and we ask the
 4
     Court for an equitable sentence in this case.
               THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. I'll keep that in
 5
 6
     mind when I make the proper sentence in this case.
 7
               Mr. Regan, now is your opportunity. Do you wish to
 8
     speak on your own behalf? Is there any information for me
     that I can consider, in addition to what your attorney has
 9
10
     just told me --
11
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: -- in mitigation of your sentence? Talk
12
     to me. You have to talk into the microphone.
13
14
               THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, sir.
15
               I prepared a statement, because I have some memory
16
     issues.
              So, I have it so I can read it.
               THE COURT: Let's make it easier for you. Move over
17
18
     to the podium and use this microphone.
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I'm sorry.
19
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
20
21
               THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to thank the Court for
22
     giving me the opportunity to speak on my behalf today.
23
               We are here today because of me and my actions. I
24
     take full responsibility for the crimes for which I have plead
25
     guilty to.
```

The one thing that I wanted to be in this world was a great dad. I screwed that up and forever changed the lives of my three kids, my family, my wife, her family and all the people that have been involved in this case. Growing up as a kid all I ever wanted to be was a great dad.

For the first few years I accomplished that. I coached little league baseball, football and was even a basketball commissioner. I lived and breathed being a good dad. Ultimately, I blew it. After a few years I allowed evil to enter be my life and my family's life.

We teach our kids about stranger danger, to stay with us in public places, because there are bad people out there in this world. For my kids the evil and the bad people came from within our own family. This place that infected my family was directed by myself and Tanya.

While on the outside our family looked and acted normal as any other family, but within things happened that should have never taken place. As a family we had great times. Sadly, all those are pushed to the back of the mind because of the horrific nature of this evil. With each of my kids I can recount great memories that I dearly cherish.

My oldest son has always been more than a son to me. We traveled the country together playing sports, working on cars, hunting, fishing and just spending time together -- I'm sorry, I lost my place. My middle child, which has always

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been the wild and crazy one, he, even at his age, was always the first one to volunteer to help someone out. The great times we had playing video games, hunting, fishing or just hanging out together. And my baby girl, never in a million years did I anticipate parties, watch cartoons for hours or just hang out together. Your Honor, these are things that I will cherish for the rest of my life. I loved all three of my kids, but realize that I made a horrific mistake. What I want more than anything is treatment and help so one day, hopefully, I will be able to make amends with my kids and with my family. Hopefully my kids will allow me to earn that opportunity in the future. What is not shown on any piece of paper in this court is the love for my kids and our family. The real me is not shown in any form in this case. I am asking the Court for a second chance one day to be the man that my mom raised, to be the dad that I've always wanted to be and have a second chance without bars and handcuffs and to be a functioning member of society. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: I hope that you're sincere when you're saying that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

1 THE COURT: Does the Government wish to be heard? 2 MR. REYNOLDS: Briefly, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: I will note that not only have I 4 5 considered the victim impact statements, but I also, as I said 6 with Ms. Regan, I have spent hours on this case and I've spent 7 a lot of time with the sentencing memorandum that the 8 Government has submitted. So keep that in mind when you make 9 your statement. Go ahead. MR. REYNOLDS: Your Honor, I'd just like to note 10 11 that everything that Christopher Regan and his wife did to his children was his idea. It was done at his insistence, at his 12 direction and was done for his sexual amusement. He is the 13 14 far more culpable party of these two. 15 Your Honor, this defendant is a danger to community. 16 These victims have suffered tremendously. The maximum sentence is absolutely appropriate in this case. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 18 I will now state the sentence determined after my 19 20 consideration of all the factors set forth in Title 18 United 21 States Code Section 3553(a), including especially the Advisory 22 Sentencing Guideline by the U.S. Sentencing Commission and the conduct committed by the defendant in his factual resume. 23 24 attorneys will have a final chance to make any legal 25 objections they have before the sentence is finally imposed.

It is the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Christopher James Regan, in Cause Number 1:19-CR-21-P, is hereby committed to the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for a period of 360 months as to Count 1, 360 months as to Count 2, 360 months as to Count 3, with each sentence to run consecutive to the others, for a total sentence of 1,080 months. This sentence shall run consecutively to any future sentence that may be imposed in Case Number B-17-0679-SB in 119th District Court in Tom Green County, Texas, which is unrelated to the incident in the case.

The Court is not ordering a fine or cost of incarceration, because the defendant does not have the financial resources or future earning capacity to pay for the fine or cost of incarceration. Although restitution is mandatory it is not ordered, because there is no restitution sought by the identified victims of these offenses.

It is further ordered that defendant shall pay an assessment pursuant to the Justice of Victims Trafficking assessment at 18 United States Code, Section 3014 of the United States in the amount of \$5,000 for each count of conviction, that's \$15,000 total, payable to the United States District Clerk, P.O. Box 1218 in Abilene, Texas, 79604. If upon commencement of the term of supervised release any party assessment imposed pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3014 remains unpaid, the defendant shall make payments on such unpaid

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

balance beginning 60 days after release from custody at the rate of at least \$150 a month until the fine is paid in full.

The Court further recommends to the United States

Bureau of Prisons that the defendant participate in Inmate

Financial Responsibility Program while in custody.

Pursuant to 18 United States Code Section 2253(a) and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.2(b)4(B), it is hereby ordered that defendant's interest in the following property is hereby condemned to the United States of America: Moto cellular phone, serial number ZY2257JXTN; LG cellular telephone, serial number 810CYQX0417260; a silver Toshiba laptop, serial number 5E078456S; a Dell laptop, serial number 6C4BBL2; a Dell laptop, serial number CJSPPQ2; a HP laptop, serial number 5CD5386N6B; a Samsung tablet, serial number --IMEI number 352087093301183; a Transcend micro SD card, 32 gigabytes; a Samsung Note 9 cellular telephone, IMEI number 356569090673413; a Samsung Note 8 cellular telephone, IMEI number 351823090767229; a Samsung cellular telephone, IMEI number 353425083599789; a purple HP laptop, serial number unknown; a blue HP laptop, serial number 5CD546218; four miscellaneous flash drives including SanDisk, Ryder and Lexar brands; nine miscellaneous SanDisk memory cards; five Brady thumb drives; a pink Chrome tablet, 4 gigabyte, serial number RK2928sdk; an Apple iPad, serial number F9FNX04MFPFL; an Apple iPad, serial number F0FP60W4FPFL; a Samsung tablet, serial

number R52GCOJY6RW; a Samsung tablet, serial number unknown; a silver Samsung Galaxy S4, serial number unknown; a Samsung Galaxy Prevail, serial number unknown; a Alcatel cellular telephone, serial number unknown; a Motorola cellular telephone, serial number unknown and miscellaneous DVDs and CDs containing child pornography.

It is further ordered that upon release from imprisonment the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of life for Count 1, life for Count 2 and life for Count 3, with each term imposed to run concurrent with the others.

Furthermore, while on supervised release the defendant shall comply with the standard conditions recommended by the U.S. Sentencing Commission at Section 5E1.3(c) of the Guidelines, shall comply with other conditions as set forth in the said order that was provided to the defendant today prior to going on the record. That order setting additional terms of supervised release has now been returned to the Court. I'll note for the record it's been signed by Mr. Regan. And with Mr. Regan's signature on the additional terms of supervised release he's acknowledged his receipt of those additional conditions, his understanding of them and his waiver of having them read in open court and he agrees to be bound by them subject to revocation of any violation of them.

It is further ordered that defendant shall pay a special assessment in the amount of \$100 per count, for a total of \$300. \$100 for each count for a total of \$300.

In determining the sentence the Court considered the Advisory Guidelines as well as the other statutory directives listed in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a). A sentence of 1,080 months is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set forth in paragraph two of Section 3553(a), reflects the seriousness of and provides a just punishment for the offense, promotes respect for the law, affords an adequate deterrence to criminal conduct and protects the public from further crimes of this defendant.

In reaching the sentence today, as I said earlier, I spent several hours considering Sentencing Guidelines and the case law, and the requirements Congress imposed upon me that I considered as a sentence in accordance with 18 U.S.C. 3553(a). Crimes for which Mr. Regan has pled guilty to which he is being sentenced to are ghastly, disgusting and deplorable. It's pained me to the depths of my being to be the judge of this case. The horrible criminal acts endured in the lengthy systematic included sexual, verbal, physical and mental abuse endured by the minor victims in this case, three of the defendant's own children and his brother, are so unspeakable I will not give them the dignity to describe in open court.

In considering the nature and the circumstances of

the offense and the history and characteristics of this defendant, it is my determination that a sentence of 90 years is sufficient but not greater than necessary when one considers the abominable nature of the defendant's crimes.

Indeed, as I said earlier, in over 20 years as a attorney, and six years as a judge, this is possibly the worst case of sexual abuse and exploitation of minors that I've ever seen. And if I stay on this bench long enough to look like these guys with the white hair, I hope I never see another.

A 90-year sentence certainly reflects the seriousness of the offense and provides a just punishment of the offense, and hopefully promotes respect for the law, although I am fearful Mr. Regan may never learn respect for the law. A sentence of 90 years provides an adequate deterrence to criminal conduct and protect the public from further crimes of this defendant. Indeed, after reviewing the record in this case, I had no doubt in my mind that if you are ever released from incarceration you will likely always be a threat to the public.

And finally, let's hope that the sentence will provide the defendant with the direction and treatment in the most efficient manner, and I hope you get some help. You have some time to consider what you did, Mr. Regan, and the effect of your actions on yourself, your children, your brother, your wife and others at large, I hope you use it wisely.

1 If I am later determined to be wrong in my 2 calculations for Mr. Regan under the Sentencing Guidelines and 3 the sentence imposed here today of 90 years would still be 4 wholly appropriate after my consideration of the factors set forth in Section 3553, and I would still impose the same 5 6 sentence. 7 Indeed, I will argue that this case is the paradigm 8 case requiring the imposition of the statutory maximum 9 sentence allowed by Congress for the crimes Mr. Regan has 10 plead guilty to. Somebody might argue that sentencing you to 11 90 years you're getting a break, and I should have protected 12 the plea agreement. And like I said to your wife, that may 13 not be wrong. I have now stated the sentence. Is there any reason 14 15 why it should not be imposed as stated? 16 MR. BLIZZARD: Judge, for the purpose of appeal, the 17 defendant objects to the sentence as procedurally and substantively unreasonable and in violation of the Eighth 18 19 Amendment of the United States. 20 THE COURT: That objection is noted and is 21 overruled. 22 Anything from the Government? MR. REYNOLDS: No, Your Honor. 23 24 THE COURT: Sentence will be imposed as stated. 25 MR. BLIZZARD: Judge, one other thing I forgot to

1 mention earlier, my client would like the Court's recommendation for placement at Seagoville. 2 THE COURT: That request is denied. 3 Does the Government have a motion? 4 MR. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. At this time we'd 5 6 ask the Court to dismiss the original indictment in this case, 7 as well as Counts 4 through 11, 13 and 14. THE COURT: Government's motion is granted. 8 9 I need to inform you of your appellate rights, 10 Mr. Regan. You do have a right to appeal the sentence that I 11 just imposed. If you decide to appeal you have the right to 12 apply for leave in forma pauperis if you're unable to pay for the cost of an appeal. 13 14 Another document that you signed that was handed to 15 me this morning, that you received prior to going on the 16 record, it's called Notice of Right to Appeal Sentence, which you've signed, as I've noted, it's been returned to me. You 17 18 understand this is the Court's notice to you that you have the 19 right to appeal, it is not your notice of your appeal. 20 do decide to appeal you must do so within 14 days, it must be 21 in writing and filed with the Court. Your attorney can assist 22 you with that if you ask him to. 23 Do you have any questions? 24 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: All right. At this time you're remanded

to the custody of the marshals. 1 2 (Proceedings Adjourned) 3 4 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 5 6 I, Monica Willenburg Guzman, CSR, RPR, certify 7 that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the foregoing entitled matter. 8 9 I further certify that the transcript fees format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial 10 11 Conference of the United States. 12 Signed this 8th day of April, 2020. 13 14 /s/Monica Guzman Monica Willenburg Guzman, CSR, RPR 15 Texas CSR No. 3386 Official Court Reporter 16 The Northern District of Texas Fort Worth Division 17 CSR Expires: 7/31/2021 18 19 Business Address: 501 W. 10th Street, Room 310 Fort Worth, Texas 76102 20 Telephone: 817.850.6681 21 E-Mail Address: mguzman.csr@yahoo.com 22 23 24 25